

10

LUC-455 / Barclay 7-52-6-7-5

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 10 2006

## Remarks

Entry of the above-noted amendments, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all claims pending are respectfully requested. By this amendment, claims 1, 15, 20, and 21 are amended and claims 10-11 are canceled. These amendments to the claims constitute a bona fide attempt by applicants to advance prosecution of the application and obtain allowance of certain claims, and are in no way meant to acquiesce to the substance of the rejections. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification (e.g., page 4, lines 16-25), and claims (e.g., previously presented claim 21) and thus, no new matter has been added. Claims 1-9 and 12-22 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Harrison et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,216; "Harrison") in view of Vishwanathan et al. (U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2003/0017836; "Vishwanathan"). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison in view of Perry (U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0089938). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison in view of Bales et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,590,127; "Bales").

These rejections are respectfully, but most strenuously, traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action's citations to the applied references, with or without modification or combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that the modification or combination of the Office Action's citations to the applied references is proper, do not teach or suggest the operator services information parameter of the initial address message that comprises the indicator for the special handling type, as recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

For explanatory purposes, applicants discuss herein one or more differences between the claimed invention and the Office Action's citations to Harrison, Vishwanathan, Perry, and Bales. This discussion, however, is in no way meant to acquiesce in any characterization that one or more parts of the Office Action's citations to Harrison, Vishwanathan, Perry, or Bales correspond to the claimed invention.

Harrison (column 1, lines 19-28) discloses:

Furthermore, in today's networks, a party using the called number when an operator uses a barge-in connection is not immediately placed in contact with the caller; i.e. the using party is first interrupted by the operator (e.g. with an explanation of the caller's situation and a request to have the called party talk with the caller). Thus, even a caller who can reasonably justify barge-in intervention is still delayed by having to call and converse with an assistance operator and then having to wait for the operator to contact the party instantly using the called number.

Harrison discloses the operator (i.e., a person) that makes a barge-in on behalf of a user. Harrison fails to disclose the operator services information parameter of the initial address message that comprises the indicator for the special handling type. Harrison also fails to disclose the mobile switching component.

Accordingly, the Office Action's citation to Harrison fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

Vishwanathan (paragraph 5, lines 1-4; FIG. 1) discloses:

MSC 110 acts as a local switching exchange (with additional features to handle mobility management requirements, discussed below) and communicates with the phone network ("PSTN") 120 through trunk groups.

Vishwanathan discloses the MSC that communicates with the public switched telephone network 120. Vishwanathan fails to disclose the operator services information parameter of the initial address message that comprises the indicator for the special handling type. Vishwanathan

also fails to disclose that the MSC performs a barge-in with the operator services information parameter of the initial address message.

Accordingly, the Office Action's citation to Harrison fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

Perry (paragraph 17) discloses the multi-service controller and multi-service fabric for distributed multi-party call control (Abstract, lines 1-2). Perry fails to disclose the operator services information parameter of the initial address message that comprises the indicator for the special handling type.

Accordingly, the Office Action's citation to Perry fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

Bales (column 2, lines 52-67) discloses the switch nodes for the shared line between the wireless terminal 123 and the communication terminal 107. Bales fails to disclose the operator services information parameter of the initial address message that comprises the indicator for the special handling type.

Accordingly, the Office Action's citation to Bales fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

The Office Action's citations to Harrison, Vishwanathan, Perry, and Bales all fail to meet at least one of applicants' claimed features. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in the Office Action's citations to Harrison, Vishwanathan, Perry, or Bales of the mobile switching component that performs the barge-in that allows the first user to communicate with the second user of the mobile communication device that is engaged in the preexisting active call, as recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

13


LUC-455 / Barclay 7-52-6-7-5

For all the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1, claims 1, 15, and 20 are believed neither anticipated nor obvious over the art of record. The corresponding dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons as independent claims 1, 15, and 20, as well as for their own additional characterizations.

Withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: July 10, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
Customer Number 47382